

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

JOSE RODRIGUEZ, JR.,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:11-cv-515

v.

Honorable Gordon J. Quist

JEFFREY STEVIE, et al.,

Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This is a civil rights action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Court has granted Plaintiff leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and Plaintiff has paid the initial partial filing fee. On February 1, 2012, this Court ordered service of Plaintiff's complaint on Defendants. On May 29, 2012, Defendant Pomeroy filed a motion for summary judgment (docket #16) on the ground that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies. The time for filing a response has now expired. Upon review, I recommend that Defendant Pomeroy's motion for summary judgment based on Plaintiff's failure to exhaust his available administrative remedies be granted.

Summary judgment is appropriate when the record reveals that there are no genuine issues as to any material fact in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. FED. R. CIV. P. 56(c); *Kocak v. Comty. Health Partners of Ohio, Inc.*, 400 F.3d 466, 468 (6th Cir. 2005); *Thomas v. City of Chattanooga*, 398 F.3d 426, 429 (6th Cir. 2005). The standard for determining whether summary judgment is appropriate is "whether the evidence presents a sufficient

disagreement to require submission to a jury or whether it is so one-sided that one party must prevail as a matter of law.” *State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. McGowan*, 421 F.3d 433, 436 (6th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 251-52 (1986)); see also *Tucker v. Union of Needletrades Indus. & Textile Employees*, 407 F.3d 784, 787 (6th Cir. 2005). The court must consider all pleadings, depositions, affidavits, and admissions on file, and draw all justifiable inferences in favor of the party opposing the motion. See *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986); *Twin City Fire Ins. Co. v. Adkins*, 400 F.3d 293, 296 (6th Cir. 2005).

A prisoner’s failure to exhaust his administrative remedies is an affirmative defense, which Defendants have the burden to plead and prove. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 215 (2007). A moving party without the burden of proof need show only that the opponent cannot sustain his burden at trial. See *Morris v. Oldham County Fiscal Court*, 201 F.3d 784, 787 (6th Cir. 2000); see also *Minadeo v. ICI Paints*, 398 F.3d 751, 761 (6th Cir. 2005). A moving party with the burden of proof faces a “substantially higher hurdle.” *Arnett v. Myers*, 281 F.3d 552, 561 (6th Cir. 2002); *Cockrel v. Shelby County Sch. Dist.*, 270 F.3d 1036, 1056 (6th Cir. 2001). “Where the moving party has the burden -- the plaintiff on a claim for relief or the defendant on an affirmative defense -- his showing must be sufficient for the court to hold that no reasonable trier of fact could find other than for the moving party.” *Calderone v. United States*, 799 F.2d 254, 259 (6th Cir. 1986) (quoting W. SCHWARZER, *Summary Judgment Under the Federal Rules: Defining Genuine Issues of Material Fact*, 99 F.R.D. 465, 487-88 (1984)). The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit repeatedly has emphasized that the party with the burden of proof “must show the record contains evidence satisfying the burden of persuasion and that the evidence is so powerful that no reasonable jury would be free to disbelieve it.” *Arnett*, 281 F.3d at 561 (quoting 11 JAMES WILLIAM MOORE,

ET AL., MOORE'S FEDERAL PRACTICE § 56.13[1], at 56-138 (3d ed. 2000); *Cockrel*, 270 F.2d at 1056 (same). Accordingly, summary judgment in favor of the party with the burden of persuasion "is inappropriate when the evidence is susceptible of different interpretations or inferences by the trier of fact." *Hunt v. Cromartie*, 526 U.S. 541, 553 (1999).

Plaintiff is presently incarcerated at the Macomb Correctional Facility. In his *pro se* complaint, he sues the Defendants Jeffrey Stevie, M.D., Prison Health Services, Inc. (PHS), Lawrence Pomeroy, Craig Hutchinson, Susan Wilson, P.A., Jeannie Stephenson, R.N., R.H.A.A., and Terry Malloy, R.H.A. Plaintiff alleges that he was told that he suffered from Hepatitis C in 2008, while he was confined at the Thumb Correctional Facility. In November of 2009, he was transferred to the Kinross Correctional Facility (KCF). Plaintiff claims that he repeatedly requested treatment for his Hepatitis C for a period of three years, to no avail. Plaintiff seeks nominal, compensatory and punitive damages, as well as declaratory and injunctive relief.

Defendant Pomeroy claims that he is entitled to summary judgment because Plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies. Pursuant to the applicable portion of the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), a prisoner bringing an action with respect to prison conditions under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 must exhaust his available administrative remedies. *See Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002); *Booth v. Churner*, 532 U.S. 731, 733 (2001). A prisoner must first exhaust available administrative remedies, even if the prisoner may not be able to obtain the specific type of relief he seeks in the state administrative process. *See Porter*, 534 U.S. at 520; *Booth*, 532 U.S. at 741; *Knuckles El v. Toombs*, 215 F.3d 640, 642 (6th Cir. 2000); *Freeman v. Francis*, 196 F.3d 641, 643 (6th Cir. 1999). In order to properly exhaust administrative remedies, prisoners must complete the administrative review process in accordance with the deadlines and other applicable procedural rules. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 218 (2007);

Woodford v. Ngo, 126 S. Ct. 2378, 2386 (2006). “Compliance with prison grievance procedures, therefore, is all that is required by the PLRA to ‘properly exhaust.’” *Jones*, 549 U.S. at 218.

MDOC Policy Directive 03.02.130 (effective July 9, 2007), sets forth the applicable grievance procedures for prisoners in MDOC custody at the time relevant to this complaint. Inmates must first attempt to resolve a problem orally within two business days of becoming aware of the grievable issue, unless prevented by circumstances beyond his or her control *Id.* at ¶ P. If oral resolution is unsuccessful, the inmate may proceed to Step I of the grievance process and submit a completed grievance form within five business days of the attempted oral resolution. *Id.* at ¶ P. The Policy Directive also provides the following directions for completing grievance forms: “The issues shall be stated briefly. Information provided shall be limited to the facts involving the issue being grieved (i.e., who, what, when, where, why, how). Dates, times, places and names of all those involved in the issue being grieved are to be included.” *Id.* at ¶ R (emphasis in original). The inmate submits the grievance to a designated grievance coordinator, who assigns it to a respondent. *Id.* at ¶ X.

If the inmate is dissatisfied with the Step I response, or does not receive a timely response, he may appeal to Step II by obtaining an appeal form within ten business days of the response, or if no response was received, within ten days after the response was due. *Id.* at ¶¶ T, DD. The respondent at Step II is designated by the policy, *e.g.*, the regional health administrator for a medical care grievances. *Id.* at ¶ GG. If the inmate is still dissatisfied with the Step II response, or does not receive a timely Step II response, he may appeal to Step III. *Id.* at ¶ FF. The Step III form shall be sent within ten business days after receiving the Step II response, or if no Step II response was received, within ten business days after the date the Step II response was due. *Id.* at ¶ FF. The Grievance and Appeals Section is the respondent for Step III grievances on behalf of the MDOC

director. *Id.* at ¶ GG. Time limitations shall be adhered to by the inmate and staff at all steps of the grievance process. *Id.* at ¶ X. “The total grievance process from the point of filing a Step I grievance to providing a Step III response shall be completed within 90 calendar days unless an extension has been approved” *Id.* at ¶ HH.

Defendant Pomeroy attaches a copy of all the grievances filed by Plaintiff through step III from May of 2009 until the present. Plaintiff filed KCF-11-11-1240-28e at step I on November 30, 2011, claiming that on November 28, 2011 his health care request was ignored, and that Cynthia M. Jenkins, R.N., and Defendant Hutchinson had refused Plaintiff’s health care requests for his terminal liver disease since December 10, 2009. The grievance states that PHS, Defendant Stevie, Jenkins, and Defendant Pomeroy were party to the denial of treatment. (Defendant Pomeroy’s Exhibit B, p. 7 of 39, docket #16-3.) Plaintiff’s grievance was rejected as being untimely:

The date of the grievance is listed as 11-28-11 and today’s date is listed as 11-30-11. However, in the body of the grievance the prisoner refers to the date of 12-10-09 as the date he documented requests to KCF medical staff. The cause of the delay is not given.

(Defendant Pomeroy’s Exhibit B, p. 8 of 39, docket #16-3.) The rejection of Plaintiff’s grievance was upheld at steps II and III. (Defendant Pomeroy’s Exhibit B, pp. 4 and 6 of 39, docket #16-3.)

Grievance KCF-11-01-0038-12d1 was filed at step I on January 7, 2011, and does not mention Defendant Pomeroy. (Defendant Pomeroy’s Exhibit B, p. 13 of 39, docket #16-3.) Grievance KCF-10-08-1070-12d2 was filed at step I on August 24, 2010, and does not mention Defendant Pomeroy. (Defendant Pomeroy’s Exhibit B, p. 18 of 39, docket #16-3.) Finally, Grievance KCF-10-04-0524-28a was filed at step I on April 21, 2010, and does not mention Defendant Pomeroy. (Defendant Pomeroy’s Exhibit B, p. 29 of 39, docket #16-3.)

Grievance KCF-11-11-1240-28e is the only one of Plaintiff's grievances that mentions Defendant Pomeroy. However, as noted above, this grievance was rejected at untimely at step I and this rejection was upheld at steps II and III. In order to exhaust administrative remedies, prisoners must complete the administrative review process in accordance with the deadlines and other applicable procedural rules. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 218 (2007); *Woodford v. Ngo*, 548 U.S. 81, 90-91 (2006). "Compliance with prison grievance procedures, therefore, is all that is required by the PLRA to 'properly exhaust.'" *Jones*, 549 U.S. at 218.

Therefore, following *Woodford*, if a plaintiff's grievance was not filed in a timely manner pursuant to the state's administrative rules, the plaintiff has not properly exhausted his administrative remedies and the claim is barred. The Supreme Court's decision regarding PLRA exhaustion, *Jones*, 549 U.S. at 217-218, did not modify this holding regarding "proper exhaustion." To the contrary, the Court drew upon the reasoning of *Woodford* when it struck down the Sixth Circuit's rule barring prisoners from bringing suit against any defendant whom the prisoner had not named in a Step I administrative grievance:

In *Woodford*, we held that to properly exhaust administrative remedies prisoners must "complete the administrative review process in accordance with the applicable procedural rules," 548 U.S., at ---, 126 S.Ct. 2378 (slip op., at 5)--rules that are defined not by the PLRA, but by the prison grievance process itself. Compliance with prison grievance procedures, therefore, is all that is required by the PLRA to "properly exhaust." The level of detail necessary in a grievance to comply with the grievance procedures will vary from system to system and claim to claim, but it is the prison's requirements, and not the PLRA, that define the boundaries of proper exhaustion. As the MDOC's procedures make no mention of naming particular officials, the Sixth Circuit's rule imposing such a prerequisite to proper exhaustion is unwarranted.

Jones, 549 U.S. at 218.

The undersigned concludes that because Plaintiff's grievance which named Defendant Pomeroy was not filed in a timely manner pursuant to the state's administrative rules, he has not properly exhausted his administrative remedies and the claim is barred.

Defendant Pomeroy asserts that even if Plaintiff had exhausted his administrative remedies, he is entitled to summary judgment because he was not personally involved in the alleged misconduct. In Plaintiff's complaint, he makes a conclusory assertion that Defendant Pomeroy ignored Plaintiff's repeated requests for medical care. However, Plaintiff fails to make specific factual allegations against Defendant Pomeroy with regard to specific denials of treatment. Government officials may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of respondeat superior or vicarious liability. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009); *Monell v. New York City Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691(1978); *Everson v. Leis*, 556 F.3d 484, 495 (6th Cir. 2009). A claimed constitutional violation must be based upon active unconstitutional behavior. *Grinter v. Knight*, 532 F.3d 567, 575 (6th Cir. 2008); *Greene v. Barber*, 310 F.3d 889, 899 (6th Cir. 2002). The acts of one's subordinates are not enough, nor can supervisory liability be based upon the mere failure to act. *Grinter*, 532 F.3d at 575; *Greene*, 310 F.3d at 899; *Summers v. Leis*, 368 F.3d 881, 888 (6th Cir. 2004). Moreover, § 1983 liability may not be imposed simply because a supervisor denied an administrative grievance or failed to act based upon information contained in a grievance. See *Shehee v. Luttrell*, 199 F.3d 295, 300 (6th Cir. 1999). "[A] plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official's own individual actions, has violated the Constitution." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676. Plaintiff has failed to allege that Defendant Pomeroy engaged in any active unconstitutional behavior. Accordingly, he fails to state a claim against Defendant Pomeroy.

For the foregoing reasons, I recommend that Defendant Pomeroy's motion for summary judgment (docket #16) be granted on the basis that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies.

/s/ Timothy P. Greeley
TIMOTHY P. GREELEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: January 24, 2013

NOTICE TO PARTIES

Any objections to this Report and Recommendation must be filed and served within 14 days of service of this notice on you. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). All objections and responses to objections are governed by W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely objections may constitute a waiver of any further right of appeal. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981); *see Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).